

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
EASTERN DIVISION

ROBERT LENOIR

PLAINTIFF

V.

NO. 1:10CV119-M-S

TIM PALMER, et al.

DEFENDANTS

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On June 28, 2010, the Plaintiff, an inmate currently in the custody of the Mississippi Department of Corrections (“MDOC”), appeared before the court for a hearing pursuant to *Spears v. McCotter*, 766 F.2d 179 (5th Cir. 1985), to determine if there exists a justiciable basis for his complaint filed under to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In his complaint, the plaintiff claims that the defendants have denied him access-to-the-courts. Specifically, the plaintiff alleges that the defendants refused him copies of documents to be used as exhibits to his state court habeas petition. At the *Spears* hearing, the plaintiff explained that with some additional effort and after he complied with the prison’s procedures, he ultimately received the copies. The plaintiff further stated that his habeas petition is still pending in state court. As relief for this perceived transgression, the plaintiff is seeking compensatory damages.

**Denial of Access-to-the-Courts**

Under the Supreme Court’s decision in *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 821, 97 S. Ct. 1491, 52 L. Ed. 2d 72 (1977), prisoners possess a constitutional right of access to courts, including having the “ability . . . to prepare and transmit a necessary legal document to court.” *Eason v. Thaler*, 73 F.3d 1322, 1328 (5th Cir. 1996) (quoting *Brewer v. Wilkinson*, 3 F.3d 816, 821 (5th Cir. 1993), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 1123 (1994)). The right of access to the courts is limited to allow prisoners opportunity to file nonfrivolous claims challenging their convictions or conditions of confinement. *Jones v. Greninger*, 188 F.3d 322, 325 (5th Cir. 1999). “Interference with a prisoner’s right to access to the courts, such as delay, may result in a constitutional

deprivation.” *Chriceol v. Phillips*, 169 F.3d 313, 317 (5th Cir. 1999) (citations omitted). However, “[a] denial-of-access-to-the-courts claim is not valid if a litigant’s position is not prejudiced by the alleged violation.” *Ruiz v. United States*, 160 F.3d 273, 275 (5th Cir. 1998); *Henthorn v. Swinson*, 955 F.2d 351, 354 (5th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 504 U.S. 988 (1992) (citing *Richardson v. McDonnell*, 841 F.2d 120, 122 (5th Cir. 1988)). It is only when a prisoner suffers some sort of actual prejudice or detriment because of the alleged denial of access to the courts that the allegation becomes one of a constitutional nature. *Walker v. Navarro County Jail*, 4 F.3d 410, 413 (5th Cir. 1993); *see Howland v. Kilquist*, 833 F.2d 639, 642 (7th Cir. 1987). A plaintiff must show real detriment, *i.e.*, true denial of access, such as the loss of a motion, the loss of a right to commence, prosecute or appeal in a court, or substantial delay in obtaining a judicial determination in a proceeding. *See Oaks v. Wainwright*, 430 F.2d 241 (5th Cir. 1970).

Despite his insistence, the constitution has not been implicated by the facts of this complaint. The Plaintiff has failed to prove or allege that he has suffered any actual injury, prejudice, or detriment as a litigant. The delay that may have been caused by the defendants’ refusal to copy exhibits does not rise to the level of a constitutional violation. Furthermore, the delay was caused, at least in part, by the plaintiff’s failure to comply with requirements for requesting copies. The Plaintiff’s claim should, therefore, be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

### **Conclusion**

It is the recommendation of the undersigned, therefore, that the plaintiff’s complaint and all defendants be dismissed for failure to state a claim.

The parties are referred to 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.1(C) for the appropriate procedure in the event any party desires to file objections to these findings and recommendations. Objections are required to be in writing and must be filed within ten days of this date. Failure to file written objections to the proposed finding and recommendations contained in this report within ten days from the date of filing will bar an aggrieved party from

challenging on appeal both the proposed factual findings and the proposed legal conclusions accepted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996).

The Plaintiff is directed to acknowledge receipt of this report and recommendation by signing the enclosed acknowledgment form and returning it to the court within ten days of this date. The Plaintiff is warned that failure to comply with the requirements of this paragraph may lead to the dismissal of this lawsuit under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute and for failure to comply with an order of the court.

This the 30th day of June, 2010.

/s/ David Sanders  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE